

09/873,509

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application. Claims 8-26 are pending in the application.

It is not believed that any additional fees are due with this Response to the Office Action, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501468.

I. Renumbering of Claims

The Examiner has stated that the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126.

Applicants have renumbered the remaining pending claims to comply with 37 CFR 1.126. Applicants have renumbered the claims so that claim 8 is the first presented independent claim. Applicants wish to point out that the Examiner had originally asked for the claims to be renumbered to 7-25 and Applicants had complied.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 8-26 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter was described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

09/873,509

Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite that the claim is directed to a "method for manufacturing a 3D image display body, said 3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display, for displaying 3D images transmitted through said liquid crystal display." Applicants have amended claim 22 to recite a "3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display for displaying 3D images transmitted through said liquid crystal display." Applicants respectfully submit that the 3D image display body, when used in conjunction with a liquid crystal display, is able to display 3D images. When the light emitted by the liquid crystal display is controlled so that the right eye image is displayed from the right eye image display parts and the left eye image is displayed from the left eye image display parts, when used in conjunction with the 3D image display body of the invention, a 3D image is formed. See, Specification page 1, lines 11-28.

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the specification and the claims also fail to teach how a half wave plate is capable of being used with a 3D display to create 3D viewing. Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite that the claim is directed to a "method for manufacturing a 3D image display body, said 3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display, for displaying 3D images transmitted through said liquid crystal display." Claim 20 has been amended to recite that the laminated phase difference film is a $\frac{1}{2}$ wave plate with phase difference functionality. Figure 2 and the accompanying description in the Specification on pages 4 and 5 describe the laminated phase difference film as a $\frac{1}{2}$ wave plate with phase difference functionality is disposed on a transparent support to help form 3D images.

09/873,509

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the specification fails to teach what is considered the phase difference film and fails to teach how the phase difference film does not possess birefringence is capable of providing retardation, Applicants respectfully traverse. The Specification (page 1, lines 11-25) describes a 3D image display device which describes a micropolarizer used to form a 3D image display device. Additionally, the Specification (page 3, lines 24-30) describes how a laminated phase difference film formed by laminating a phase difference film that does not possess birefringence and a drawn PVA film that possesses phase difference function can be used to display a 3D image.

Applicants respectfully request that, in light of the amendments, the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejections be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which is regarded as the invention.

Applicants have amended independent claims 8-26 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, Applicants have addressed the Examiner's objection regarding the phrase "3D image display body." Applicants have also addressed the Examiner's objection to phrases "appropriate members" and interoperability among elements by amending independent claim 22. Applicants now recite a "3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display for displaying 3D images transmitted through said

09/873,509

liquid crystal display, said 3D image display body comprising: a support; an adhesive agent interposed on said support; a laminated phase difference film disposed on said support using said adhesive agent; transparent resist members having right eye image display parts and left-eye image display parts formed on said laminated phase difference film; wherein said transparent resist members are UV resin, PVA-type adhesive agent or acrylic-type tacky adhesive agent; and a protective member disposed on said laminated phase difference film.”

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,359,664 to Faris (“Faris”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,738 to Okamoto (“Okamoto”).

The Examiner states that Faris teaches a display system for visually displaying a polarized spatially multiplexed image of a 3D object having left eye image and right eye image mixed within, for use in stereoscopic viewing. The Examiner admits however that Faris does not explicitly teach including a protective and adhesive layer. The Examiner states that Okamoto in the same field of endeavor teaches a polarizer utilized in a liquid crystal display device wherein the polarizer layer is interposed between a pair of TAC film and is adhered via an adhesive layer to a transparent glass substrate. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the micropolarizer of Faris to make it adhere to a glass substrate via an adhesive layer and be covered with a protective layer for the benefit of easy adoption of the micropolarizer to the display device or display member for

09/873,509

stereoscopic viewing and for the benefit of protecting it from foreign dusts therefore enhancing the viewing quality.

Applicants have amended independent claims 8 and 22 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 8 recites a "method for manufacturing a 3D image display body, said 3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display, for displaying 3D images transmitted through said liquid crystal display, said method comprising the steps of: laminating a phase difference film onto a transparent support with an adhesive agent interposed; attaching transparent resist members in specified positions onto said phase difference film; immersing a resulting assembly in hot water and drying said assembly; attaching a protective member to said resist members." Claim 22 has been amended to recite a "3D image display body configurable for bonding to the surface of a liquid crystal display for displaying 3D images transmitted through said liquid crystal display, said 3D image display body comprising: a support; an adhesive agent interposed on said support; a laminated phase difference film disposed on said support using said adhesive agent; transparent resist members having right eye image display parts and left-eye image display parts formed on said laminated phase difference film; wherein said transparent resist members are UV resin, PVA-type adhesive agent or acrylic-type tacky adhesive agent; and a protective member disposed on said laminated phase difference film."

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are not rendered obvious by the teachings of Faris in combination with the teachings of Okamoto. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in Faris of using a phase difference film on a transparent support. Additionally, there is no teaching in Okamoto of using a phase

09/873,509

difference film onto a transparent support. The Examiner states that Faris teaches using a phase difference film on a transparent support with the disclosure of a back lit hardcopy transparency (see Faris column 8, lines 8-11). Applicants respectfully submit that the back lit support taught by Faris is a backlighting support structure for the liquid crystal display and therefore is not the same transparent support which Applicants claim in the subject application. The transparent support as disclosed by Applicants is a part of a structure which can be bonded to the liquid crystal display for displaying 3D images. It does not provide a backlight for the display. Further, present invention, as recited in the claims, does not need electro-optical support – that is, electricity is not needed to power the image display body of the present invention, in contrast to any backlight. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, either in view of Faris or Okamoto or any combination thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing remarks are applicable to independent claims 8 and 22. Claims 9-21 and 23-26, by their dependency on claims 8 and 22, are therefore also allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and reconsideration of the claim rejections in light of the preceding amendment and remarks. Applicants respectfully request early notice of allowance for all of the pending claims.

09/873,509

V. Provisional Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 8-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-28 of copending application serial number 09/874,415.


The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 8-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending application serial number 09/873,690.

Applicants are prepared to file a Terminal Disclaimer upon allowance of the pending claims.

VI. Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants believes that all of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Bosco B. Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Date: April 8, 2004
REVEO, INC.
85 Executive Boulevard
Elmsford, New York 10523
Telephone (914) 798-7281
Facsimile: (914) 345-9558